

Conference Paper

Intercultural Communication in the Cultural Dimension

Zhilina V. A.

Head of Department of philosophy, Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Doctor of philosophy, associate professor, Magnitogorsk, Russia

Abstract

The article deals with the problem of intercultural communication as an autonomous phenomenon in culture. In the analysis of the terminological instability of the definition of this phenomenon, the structuring of its ontological characteristics is proposed. Intercultural communication is defined in the characteristics of the communicative subject. The role of intercultural communications in the symbolic world of human existence is proved.

Keywords: subject, culture, intercultural communication, language, myth, art, religion

Corresponding Author:

Zhilina V. A.

Received: 12 February 2019

Accepted: 21 February 2019

Published: 3 March 2020

Publishing services provided by
Knowledge E

© Zhilina V. A.. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the Man in the world of culture Conference Committee.

1. Introduction

Nowadays, the theoretical analysis of culture, regardless of the subject of research, often addresses the specifics, mechanisms, and forms of intercultural communication. From the point of view of philosophical perception of the modern society, it seems logical and, to some extent, can be classified as a necessary component of cultural analysis. If communication is the universal characteristic of the modern social subject, then, undoubtedly, the institutions of culture can operate only in the samples of communicative flows [2].

2. Methods

Globalization as a form of coexistence of individual ethnic groups, countries and states also increases the pertinence of the issues of intercultural communication. Responding to the needs of practice, the theory introduces this category into the system of available tools reasonably fundamentally: through the interpretation of the essence of intercultural communication as a dialogue which is often socially well-defined (within one ethnic group, between ethnic groups, between nations, etc.). But such a logical-linguistic approach provides no opportunity for a fundamental demarcation of the essence of the phenomenon.

 **OPEN ACCESS**

Intercultural communication can be understood as a process of mutual understanding, as a kind of information exchange, as a special form of communication, as a specific type of human activity or as a certain type of relationship between social actors [1]. Due to the fundamental differences of these characteristics, it becomes clear that semantic uncertainty may well lead to a violation of the integrity of cultural analysis [3]. Moreover, the effectiveness of the latter can be significantly improved if the ontological aspects of this phenomenon are revealed.

3. Discussion

Obviously, the characterization of the social subject as a communicative phenomenon is induced by the information growth addressed to the subject and the growth of integrative ties within society. Ethnic cultures, mutually influencing each other, create new forms, and the multiple processes of domination and decline give the subject a certain sense of being surrounded by many cultures with which he has to contact. It should be noted that the process is complicated by the fact that within the traditional institutions of native culture there is also a multiplication of forms that require correct treatment. This creates the illusion of a new problem, namely the problem of intercultural communication. The term itself was introduced mainly by the philologists in the second half of the XX century with the purpose of analyzing the influence of foreign languages on the perception of culture by the subject.

However, going beyond the linguistic dimension illustrates the problem of intercultural communication from a new perspective, referring the researcher to the sphere of rationality. Human mind determines his presence not so much in the physical world as in the symbolic world. In the process of the historical "maturation", the mankind is increasingly distancing from things as such and is referring to them through an appeal to itself. In this regard, intercultural communication accompanies a person since their arrival as a way of inculturation in the symbolic field of culture.

The complexity of intercultural communication is that it is both a form of information reflection and a form of preserving the meaning of consciousness. For example, a long hard conversation between a Person and God can reveal all the difficulties of intercultural communication, when in the man-made "culture of God" a person seeks to discover the meaning of his own cultural dimension of the world.

When conceptualizing symbolism of culture, the Marburg school of neo-Kantian philosophy distinguishes language, myth, art and religion as the main mechanisms for the formation of the symbolic world of man [4]. Gradually, the symbolic world displaces

all other layers of existence, and in this domination, intercultural communication is becoming a means of revealing the true meaning in the surrounding symbols. While becoming a part of the symbolic universe of man, intercultural communication, through its content, reflects the general state of culture. So, intercultural communication can be considered as determinant of cultural change, and as a criterion for the state of its main institutions.

Following the concept of the structure of the symbolic world of man proposed by E. Cassirer, it is necessary to state that language in culture is significantly transformed today as a structural unit [4]. Language in culture today is significantly transformed as a structural unit. The observed multilingualism determines multiculturalism as a universal form of many cultural institutions. The linguistic "turn" changes the essence of intercultural communication, which now becomes a facet of subjective characteristics [5].

This facet accumulates the potency of effective integration of the subject in the field of culture that opens before it. In the multilingual state, the subject runs the risk of ignoring the rules of language semantics and, as a result, violating its semantic adaptation. Such a state cannot but affect the myth-making component of human activity.

Even today, mythology remains the main way of socialization in communicating the general content of culture to the individualization of the subject. Intercultural communication, emerging in the context of mechanization of social life, one way or another, embraces a field of scientific rationality. But when processed within the ordinary world perception, rationality is replaced by the simulacrum of science. As a result, intercultural communication begins to multiply the field of pseudoscience, which the subject models as his own everyday world. In turn, for these reasons, the content and role of the institute of art cannot but be transformed.

Undoubtedly, art in the symbolic world can be considered as a holistic factor that unites all the other parts. The appeal to the historical traditions of philosophy shows clearly the consistent character of everything that takes place in the social development. Thus, the famous Hegel's consideration of the logic of the development of art - from symbolism and through classicism to romanticism - can now be considered proven by the content of social practice. Indeed, the dominance of the spiritual over the sensual begins the process of self-destruction of art. Ideological dominance in art leads to the extinction of its life forces and at the same time drives into the negation of negation [2]. The latter today manifests itself in the dominance of form over content, which for G. Hegel serves as some starting point.

However, to paraphrase a famous saying, it should be noted that art does not tolerate emptiness. The negativity of romantic art and the emerging emptiness of a symbolic work of art are filled, for example, with fear or absurdity. The consequence is a symbolic loss of a person in culture, and this changes the role of religion [6]. In the new forms determined by intercultural communication the value of God and numinous in general is underestimated. The emphasis is on the miracle, momentary success and the achievement of the desired. Intercultural communication combines neo-cults into a certain sect of sellers of air, from business coaches to healthy lifestyle gurus.

4. Conclusions

Thus, when analyzing the role, place and essence of intercultural communication, we can state that today the phenomenon is no longer reduced to a simple form of interaction of cultural layers. Intercultural communication by its procedural nature is able to displace resistance and stability of information adaptation of the subject. The social subject becomes blurred and fluid. Accordingly, the reference to this phenomenon in cultural analysis should take into account its subject transformations.

References

- [1] L.N. Vaulina, "Russia intercultural communication development theory," *Vestnik of Kostroma State University. Series: Pedagogy. Psychology. Sociokinetics*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 207–212, 2011.
- [2] V.A. Zhilina, "Paradigm of communicative aspect of education," *Philosophy of Education*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp.189-195, 2009.
- [3] S.N. Ikonnikova, "Cultural studies in the new paradigm of the XXI century," *Bulletin of the St. Petersburg state Institute of culture*, pp. 30-35, 2004. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kulturologiya-v-novoy-paradigme-xxi-veka>
- [4] E. Cassirer, *Philosophy of symbolic forms*. Moscow: Centre for humanitarian initiatives, 2015.
- [5] N.V. Kuznetsova, V.A. Zhilina, E.A. Zhilina, "Knowledge Management and Knowledge Regenerating: Main Risks of Liberal Modern Arts Education," *Perspectives of Science and Education*, no. 6 (36), pp. 18–26, 2018. doi: 10.32744/pse.2018.6.2.
- [6] M.P. Akhmetzyanova, V.A. Zhilina, M.S. Teplykh, E.G. Chernova, A.I. Nazaricheva, L.R. Slobozhankina, "Cognitive Faith as an Attributive Phenomenon of Cognition," *Man in India*, vol. 97, no.14, pp. 329–339, 2017.